

REMARKS

Claims 1-27 were pending in the present application. Claims 1-27 have been rejected. Claims 10-27 have been canceled. Claims 1-9 have been amended, in part to improve readability (e.g. removing "said"), grammar and correct minor inconsistencies, as well as more accurately state Applicant's invention. No new matter has been added.

Accordingly, Applicant further asserts that since all of the elements and their relationships claimed were either earlier claimed or inherent in the claims as examined, no additional search is necessitated and an Advisory Action is inappropriate. For instance, Claim 1 as amended includes elements and relations of original claims 1, 5 and 9, in various forms and basis is additionally found, for instance, throughout the Specification and more particularly in paragraphs [0032], [0033], and [0034]. Other amended claims are similarly situated. Accordingly, claims 1-9 are now pending in the present application, and each and all stand ready for allowance.

SPECIFICATION OBJECTIONS

The Examiner has noted that the Abstract exceeds 150 words in length and has indicated other informalities. Applicant notes the original Abstract is less than 110 words. However, Applicant has attended to these objections and amended the Abstract accordingly to overcome the objections. Applicant requests the objection be removed.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claims 2, 4, 11, 13, 14, 20, 22, 23 were objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant has attended to correcting pending claims affected by the objection and request the objection be removed.

CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 USC § 112, ¶ 1

Claims 1-27 have been rejected under 35 USC §112, paragraph 1, for failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicant advances the following arguments and has additionally attended to correcting pending claims affected by the objection, thereby rendering the objection moot.

More specifically, Examiner has rejected claims 1, 10 and 19 for their recitation of “plurality of data structure elements”. Applicant notes that more than one data structure element is provided for each data structure in the present invention and cites paragraph [0028] in particular of the present application as basis: “The exemplary BLOB 20 shown in the figure **comprises a first data element ID 26, a first data type 28, a first data length 30, a second data element ID 32, a second data type 34 and a second data length 36.** These describe, respectively, a first character data value 38 and a second character data value 40 that form the exemplary CLOB 22. The illustrated BLOB/CLOB pair 20/22 is for exemplary purposes only, and **the BLOB 20 may define any number of data elements, by means of any suitable coding method, not limited by the example illustrated. The CLOB 22, likewise, may define any number of data values.**”

More specifically, Examiner has also rejected claims 1, 5-6, 10, 19 and 23-24 for their recitations of “second parsing” and “third parsing.” Applicant notes that parsing steps are set forth in the Specification and more specifically, in one non-limiting example, at paragraph [0032], line 5 to end: “In a first step 52, the received BLOB/CLOB pair **is parsed** to ascertain the version and release information, or absence of same, of the caller. A first comparison 54 is performed to determine if the caller’s version and release is identical to that of the stored procedure. **If the comparison is true**, the version and release information matches, **then parsing** of character data elements known to both the caller and the stored procedure occurs at step 56. In the example of FIG. 2, character data elements #1 and #2 are parsed.” Hence, there are multiple parsing steps set forth.

Accordingly, Applicant requests all rejections hereunder, for claims identified and their depending claim counterparts, be removed or withdrawn.

CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-8, 10-17, and 19-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent 6,971,09381 to Spring (hereinafter Spring) in view of United States Patent 5,742,810 to Ng et al. (hereinafter Ng). Claims 9, 18, and 27 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Spring in view of Ng, and further in view of United States Patent 5,579,509 to Furtney et al (hereinafter Furtney).

Applicant notes that Examiner has stated on Page 7 of the Office Action: “Spring does explicitly disclose receiving, from a calling program, a plurality of data structure

elements used for communicating data between the stored procedures and the calling program." Applicant believes Examiner meant to note that "Spring does not explicitly disclose receiving, from a calling program, a plurality of data structure elements used for communicating data between the stored procedures and the calling program."

Affirmation of Applicant's belief is requested.

Examiner continues the rejection stating that "Ng discloses receiving (col. 1, lines 49-53), from a calling program (col. 1, lines 56-59), a plurality of data structure elements used for communicating data between the stored procedures and the calling program (col. 2, lines 47-50). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the data structure of Spring with the teachings of BLOB/CLOB pair from Ng because this feature would have provided a mechanism to translate a host variable that is not recognized as a SQL data type into a BLOB, in order to pass the host variable to a stored procedure (col. 2, lines 7-15 and 23-29 of Ng)." Nonetheless, Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Firstly, with respect to Claim 1, Applicant asserts that Spring is not instructive and does not teach towards Applicant's invention. Applicant's claim 1 as amended provides for "receiving from a calling program, a data structure having data structure elements used for communicating data between the stored procedures and the calling program;" Spring is not so situated. Further, it is suggested that the Interacting Modules compatible with the Core Module as described in Spring disclose parsing only the data structure elements that are known to both the calling program and the stored procedures. Applicants respectfully traverse this Assertion and find no such basis

present in Spring. Accordingly, Applicant asserts that Spring does not teach and does not disclose what has been asserted and requests removal of the rejection.

Ng at column 2, lines 27 -35 provides receiving a character string which is not character type data nor is such of data structure elements. More specifically, Ng provides for: "Since a variable length string has a **different internal** structure from a character data type in SQL, the client application program copies the varying length string to a temporary SQL character data type. This SQL character data type is sent to the database management system on the server. Upon receipt, the database management system **invokes the adapter for the stored procedure. The adapter creates a varying length string handle for the data area in the SQL character data type structure and passes the handle to the stored procedure.** After the stored procedure populates the structure, **the SQL character data type is ready to be returned** to the client." Hence, Ng does not receive from a calling program, a data structure having data structure elements used for communicating data between the stored procedures and the calling program. Ng merely creates a handle from a string instead of transforming such string or using a data structure having data elements for communicating. Ng does not teach and does not disclose what has been asserted. Accordingly, Applicant asserts that Ng does not teach and does not disclose what has been asserted and requests removal of the rejection.

Further the combination of Spring in view of Ng, in Applicant's view, appears misplaced. If Spring were to create the handle of Ng for the stored procedure of Spring, modified Spring still would be incapable of receiving from a calling program, a data structure **having data structure elements used for communicating data between**

the stored procedures and the calling program. Further the present invention in view of such would not operate as intended, if at all.

Secondly, with respect to Claim 1, including aspects of original filed and rejected claim 9, Applicant asserts that Furtney does not teach or instruct towards **“obtaining version control information from a library”** and instead is antithetic to the present invention. Furtney, at column 3, lines 13-30, and lines 57-61, provides a component version table, which is essentially a mapping or lookup table, for software in relation to looking up a compatible version in a formatted field. The Furtney table does provide version control information for a comparing step as in the present invention, nor is such envisioned or disclosed in Furtney. Accordingly, Applicant asserts that Furtney does not teach and does not disclose what has been asserted and requests removal of the rejection.

Further, whether alone or in varied combination with one another, Applicant asserts that none of Spring, Ng or Furtney anticipate or render the present invention obvious. Accordingly Applicant requests removal of the rejection with regards to Claim 1 and all claims depending variously therefrom, as all pending claims are ready for allowance.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly Applicant asserts all rejections have been rendered moot or have been traversed, and respectfully requests Examiner to withdraw all rejections. Applicant therefore respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims as now presented. Applicant respectfully requests that this Amendment under 37 CFR §1.116 be entered by the Examiner, placing claims 1-9 in condition for allowance.

Applicants submit that the proposed amendments presented do not raise new issues or necessitate the undertaking of any additional search of the art by the Examiner, since all of the elements and their relationships claimed were either earlier claimed or inherent in the claims as examined. Therefore this Amendment should allow for immediate action by the Examiner.

Applicants respectfully request entry of this amendment and timely notice of allowance. Furthermore, Applicants submit that entry of this Amendment would place the application in better form for appeal, should the Examiner dispute the patentability of the pending claims.

In this Amendment, Applicant has amended claims 1-9 and cancelled claims 10-27 from further consideration in this application. Applicant is not conceding that the subject matter encompassed by claims 1-9 and 10-27, prior to this Amendment is not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner. Claims 1-9 were amended and claims 10-27 were

cancelled in this Amendment solely to facilitate expeditious prosecution of the allowable subject matter noted by the Examiner. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to pursue claims, including the subject matter encompassed by claims 1-9 and 10-27, as presented prior to this Amendment and additional claims in one or more continuing applications.

The Office Action contains characterizations of the claims and the related art with which Applicant does not necessarily agree. Unless expressly noted otherwise, Applicants decline to subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

Should any unresolved issues remain, Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

April 1, 2008

/Joseph A. Sawyer, Jr./

Joseph A. Sawyer, Jr.

Reg. No. 30,801

Customer Number 45728

(650) 493-4540

(650) 493-4549